

if restriction were not required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not shown that there would be a serious burden for the Examiner to examine all of the claims of the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are therefore respectfully requested.

Response to Election of Species

Also at page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that if Group I is elected, then an election of species would be required. In particular, the Examiner stated that an election would be required between the following species: a) alloys in which zirconium is the dominant element and b) alloys in which iron is the dominant element.

In response, applicants elect **species b) alloys in which iron is the dominant element**. Claims 1 – 6 and 8 – 13 read on the elected species. The requirement of election of species is traversed on the grounds that there would not be a serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the species of the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for election of species are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 503333.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: July 24, 2006

By: 

Ralph T. Webb
Registration No. 33, 047

1400 Eye St., NW., Ste 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510